



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

on venereal disease rate which appeared in *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* comparing rates of foreign armies with the rate of the Army of the United States.

The annual venereal disease rate for the United States Army for 1907 is as quoted—167.82. The following rates obtained for the corresponding years:

1905.....	178.2	1912.....	115.7
1906.....	158.9	1913.....	85.8
1907.....	167.8	1914.....	89.8
1908.....	174.8	1915.....	83.6
1909.....	177.5	1916.....	91.2
1910.....	155.1	1917.....	113.9
1911.....	165.8		

In comparing the venereal rates for the American troops with rates of foreign armies, it must be borne in mind that there are included on the American venereal register all cases of venereal diseases, whether acute or chronic, whether hospitalized or otherwise; whereas with foreign armies it has been the custom to report only those cases, such as acute cases, which are hospitalized. The difference caused by such a procedure is obvious when it is realized that only a small proportion of the total number of cases of venereal diseases at the present time are hospitalized. Furthermore, it is probably true that prior to this war there prevailed in the American Army more careful diagnosis, treatment, physical inspections and reporting than there did among foreign armies. Thus the venereal rate in the United States Army would doubtless be lower than the rates for foreign armies, were methods of diagnosis, treatment and reporting alike.

It is of interest to note the factors which caused the variations in the venereal rates for the reported years. Beginning with 1908 the principles of preventive medicine were first applied thoroughly to the army, including routine physical inspections. Naturally the rate increased with the coming to light of many cases hitherto not discovered. In 1911 the rate again increased, due to an increase in incidence of syphilis directly the result of the introduction of the Wassermann reaction for diagnosis. A general decrease is noted from this point on. Prophylaxis was urged beginning 1911. The slight increase in 1916 is largely due to our concentrating troops on the Mexican border.

The increase in the rate for 1917 can be attributed to the great change which took place in the Army of the United States during the last four months of 1917, due to the draft.

From the middle of September to the present date there have been reported more than 135,000 cases of venereal diseases among troops in the United States. Records show that of this number, approximately only 15% were cases contracted after enlistment, and that the bulk of cases were brought into the Army by the civilian draftees. So where formerly our annual venereal rate within the Army had never been reduced below 83 per thousand men, at the present time for cases contracted after enlistment the annual rate averages approximately 20 per thousand men. This reduction is the result of the intensive campaign to combat venereal disease as proposed by the Surgeon General of the Army. This campaign is not devoted to the Army alone but is spread throughout the country to make the civilian communities realize their responsibility with regard to this question, and to assist such communities in meeting the problem.

It is also desired to call your attention to the low venereal rate of the American Expeditionary Force. The annual rate per thousand for overseas troops averages below 40, and for the week of August 9th was below 20 per thousand.

WILLIAM F. SNOW,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Corps.

SHALL GERMANS TEACH FRENCH?

SIR,—That hardship will be worked in specific cases, and that confusion will fall upon college presidents and superintendents as the question of allowing teachers of German to become teachers of French, comes more insistently to the fore, is not to be doubted. And because it is a

question of principle it cannot be winked at. That the great majority of teachers of German took no interest in France or things French prior to the war, and that, with few exceptions, they did take immediate and instinctive stand against France, and sought to vindicate Germany, are well-known facts. And now many of these teachers, men and women specially trained in German methods and German points of view, i. e., in German *Kultur*, are preparing overnight, as it were, to teach French! Let us not forget that it has been dinned into us for years what peculiarly thorough training, preferably in Germany, was essential to the making of a good German teacher. What of the insult to French implied by the assumption of such persons that changing to French is as simple as changing coats? And what an illuminating comment upon true German thoroughness! And yet this ludicrous language-somersault is being turned in many a university, college, and school without shadow of justification. We do not deny that there may be justifiable cases. In nine cases out of ten (ninety-nine out of a hundred would probably be nearer right) it is an instance of "any port in a storm"; an exemplification of the belief of one well-known head of a now moribund German department that "the present prejudice against Germans will soon die out." We are inclined to believe, as we hope, that it will continue to doomsday in the afternoon.

That courses on such men as Goethe will continue to be offered in every college is to be wished. That they will not continue to be given by those who have been giving them, i. e., by anyone who *has been* pro-German, or lukewarm, since Germany in July, 1914, assumed the rôle of civilization's murderer, is devoutly to be prayed. The fact becomes clearer every day that to the rank and file of honest Americans, German is the language of a people that has no regard for its word, and that commits rape, torture and murder wholesale. To all such, the German nation is a nation of efficiently educated savages. That this is so proves what we should all rejoice at, namely, that as a people there is much health in us. Few or no students want to take German. Hence the going over to French, as one German teacher, always a loud defender of the invasion of Belgium, and anti-British still, despite the fact that Britain is our ally, recently expressed it.

It is plain that no better medium could be devised for the development of pro-German sentiment, anti-French, British, Italian, American, anti all the Allies, anti-democracy, than setting German-minded persons, i. e., persons steeped for years in German ways of thinking, to teach French to our youth. Doing this thing is playing into the hands of the enemy. Allowing it is not to be excused upon any grounds of pity or Christian charity. The point is that the leopard does not change his spots; at least, not easily, or often, or ever overnight. Furthermore, this "going over to French" is fraught with incalculably grave dangers to that ultimate American-French friendship which is to be worked for and prayed for with the same zeal as the parallel friendship with Britain.

Finally, while there is no need to discuss the quality of French which the guttural German habit must of necessity impart, there remains the all-important question as to the finer aspect of the whole subject; the question as to delicacy and justice, and the exquisite virility which, per se, may be said to be French, and is the very opposite of German-mindedness. In a word, how about *politesse*, which word alone expresses the precious

thing involved? *Politesse* stands for France and things French, and only a Frenchman could be expected to define it, and only that teaching of French can be really good which succeeds in making somewhat of this marvelous thing a very part of the student's actual being.

Opposed to all this stands *Deutschtum*, *Kultur*, Germanism, i. e., those bestial acts, backed by a long-standing bestial philosophy, by which the world has come to know the true Germany, and knowing, hate. Is *Deutschtum* to be allowed to usurp the place of *politesse* among us, so far at least as it is to be found among us? Worse yet, is it to be allowed to prevent its blessed spread? This is what will happen if the "going over to French" is not courageously met and checked. Upon the college president and school superintendent the great responsibility devolves. The measure of their firmness in meeting the responsibility will establish, individually, the measure of their intelligence and patriotism. On their attitude in this matter will depend much of the quality of this country's higher education during the next half-century. Will these men dodge the issue or meet it squarely?

ALFRED M. BROOKS.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IND.

IT MUST BE DONE

SIR,—Just lately I have had brought before me (I am sorry to say for the first time) THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and I cannot forbear writing to you and expressing my appreciation of your admirable and virile articles, showing, as appears to me, a grasp of the issues before the peoples of the world such as I have not come across in any other publicist.

But in addition to this there are the vital factors of the war, and here again it seems to me that you have formed a just conception of the Thing we are up against, of the sacrifices involved, and of the supreme end of your efforts, viz: to kill Germans and to exterminate the Prussian brood with its instincts of bestiality, cruelty and lust, and those instincts ineradicable except by wiping their possessors off the disfigured face of civilization.

The basic mistake, which more than anything else has been responsible for the disastrous conduct of the war throughout, has been shortness of view, and one therefore cannot but feel heartened to find a man like yourself wielding so wide an influence in your great country, bidding your fellow-citizens to prepare as though for a five years' war. In those frenzied first days of August, 1914, the present writer was but a voice crying in the wilderness. All our experts, economic and military, preached that no great Power could carry on war for longer than three months, and however elastic that three months became it was the will-o'-the-wisp perpetually dancing before them, putting a false optimism into the minds of the people and bringing into their hearts the sickness of deferred hope. The dictum of Lord Kitchener that preparation should be made for a three years' war was not generally accepted, and the few in authority who moulded their views accordingly were held on all sides to have small grounds for the opinion beyond the weight of its author's experience and judgment.

Under these circumstances the writer's urgent contention, from the first day of the conflict, that the Allied nations should give heed to the